

Contesting Ceremony, Constructing Byzantium

Reading Pseudo-Kodinos in Early Modern Europe

NATHANAEL ASCHENBRENNER

Introduction

In 1757, in the preface to the first volume of his massive *Histoire du Bas-Empire, en commençant à Constantin le Grand*, the French historian Charles Le Beau imagined the Roman Empire as a body progressing through the stages of life. Le Beau proposed to describe the empire's dotage, which persisted for more than a thousand years until its last agonal gasp.¹ This view of the Byzantine Empire as a political embodiment of corporeal degeneration was echoed and amplified by Edward Gibbon, whose own history of Roman imperial decline, almost twenty years later, surpassed Le Beau's in enduring authority. So pervasive has been the vision associated with Gibbon and Le Beau that the specter of decline still haunts our discipline and elicits rebuttals in modern books and articles, despite its evident obsolescence.

This paradigm of decline may no longer need refutation, but it could use historicization. For while Gibbon and his *oeuvre*, his method and his intellectual context have been the focus of abundant research, it is startling that the foundations of Byzantine scholarship on which he and other Enlightenment historians built have received far less attention.² Gibbon sits at the

summit of early modern European historical writing on the Byzantine Empire, yet the flanks of the peak have hardly been surveyed.³ We still need fundamental studies on the methods and works of major early modern Byzantine scholars; not even Charles Du Cange, commonly acclaimed as the "Father of Byzantine Studies," has received more than cursory treatment for his pioneering treatises on Byzantine numismatics, genealogy, and lexicography.⁴ We cannot yet explain how Byzantine scholarship developed in concert with or distinction from other early modern intellectual programs

Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, 6 vols. (Cambridge, 1999–2015); see also C. Roberts, *Edward Gibbon and the Shape of History* (Oxford, 2014); P. B. Craddock, *Edward Gibbon, Luminous Historian, 1772–1794* (Baltimore, 1989); D. Womersley, *The Transformation of The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1988). An older study, praised by Arnaldo Momigliano, is G. Falco, *La polemica sul medioevo* (Turin, 1933), 191–340.

3 An important recent monograph adds great nuance to our understanding of chiefly eighteenth-century historiography on Byzantium: E. Bianco, *La Bisanzio dei Lumi: L'impero bizantino nella cultura francese e italiana da Luigi XIV alla rivoluzione* (Bern, 2015); her portrait of Charles Le Beau shows that despite his introductory declarations quoted above, he actually treated some of the familiar villains of Byzantine history—such as the iconoclasts and Komnenoi—with surprising judiciousness and acuity (pp. 239–65).

4 Of note is the short, but sweet, J.-M. Spieser, "Du Cange and Byzantium," in *Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes*, ed. R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys (Aldershot, Hampshire, 2000), 199–210; see also J. Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage* (Cambridge, 2008), 250–87; Bianco, *La Bisanzio dei Lumi*, 93–106.

1 C. Le Beau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire, en commençant à Constantin le Grand*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1757), 1–2.

2 Most recently, of course, Gibbon and the cultural and intellectual context for his masterpiece have been treated exhaustively in J. G. A.

like classical philology and antiquarianism. We have much to learn about how scholars mobilized the Byzantine past in response to confessionalization, the Ottoman threat, and fraught disputes over state formation and the respective spheres of ecclesiastical and political authority.⁵ Such lacunae mean that we know little about the early modern dynamics that affect our scholarly enterprise today. From the editions of texts we are still compelled to use, to some of the fundamental categories and interpretations with which we still wrestle, early modern Byzantine scholarship still lurks silently in our discipline and requires renewed engagement if we are to come to grips with it.

Excellent work has prepared us to embark on what must be a collaborative scholarly endeavor. Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the afterlife of Byzantium in early modern Europe has been the focus of renewed attention. Building on foundational work on Byzantine cultural influence in the Balkans and Russia, important publications have greatly enriched our understanding of the innovative use of Byzantine cultural forms in early modern art, literature, music, and architecture.⁶ However, these studies have inclined strongly toward cultural reception, and they speak less to the formations of our discipline as a part of the history of early modern European scholarship or intellectual history.

Another branch of twentieth-century scholarship has attempted to outline the history of Byzantine

studies. Even so, these learned articles have not advanced much beyond bare genealogies of renowned scholars and their publications.⁷ They have identified key figures and contributions in early modern learned culture relating to Byzantium, and they have gone some way toward canonizing some of the key contributors to early Byzantine scholarship, such as Hieronymus Wolf, Philippe Labbe, and Du Cange. Yet these nascent efforts have given too little attention to the context and commitments of individuals and their works.

Agostino Pertusi identified and partially rectified this shortcoming in his deeply erudite monograph *Storiografia umanistica e mondo bizantino*, published in 1967.⁸ Ranging from Renaissance translations to Enlightenment syntheses, the Italian savant demonstrated how deeply specific intellectual programs, as well as cultural and political circumstances, affected the approaches taken and conclusions drawn by early modern scholars of the Byzantine world. His innovative essay attempted to identify the major trends in the development of this multifaceted intellectual program, but the very breadth of his vision leaves us much work to do in fleshing out his framework.

This article, then, follows Pertusi's lead in the case of a single text, Pseudo-Kodinos's fourteenth-century treatise on ceremonies, examining in detail the contexts of several early modern readings of the text in order to provide provisional answers to some of the questions posed above. Pseudo-Kodinos is hardly Prokopios, and his treatise on court ceremony and hierarchy is today not even the most well-known Byzantine text on the subject, having been eclipsed in that regard

5 For a recent contribution on antiquarianism, see A.-M. Cheny, *Une bibliothèque byzantine: Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc et la fabrique du savoir* (Ceyzérieu, 2015), which examines the role of the famed antiquary and polymath Peiresc in the development of Byzantine studies in seventeenth-century France.

6 A trend perhaps inaugurated by N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance: Continuation de l'«Histoire de la vie byzantine»* (Bucharest, 1935). More recently, see L. Clucas, ed., *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe* (Boulder, CO, 1988); J. J. Yiannias, ed., *The Byzantine Tradition after the Fall of Constantinople* (Charlottesville, VA, 1991). On Byzantium in modern Greek culture, see D. Ricks and P. Magdalino, eds., *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* (Aldershot, Hampshire, 1998). For recent work extending these questions of cultural influence to other parts of early modern Europe, see M.-F. Auzépy, ed., *Byzance en Europe* (Saint-Denis, 2003); F. Kolovou, ed., *Byzanzrezeption in Europa: Spurensuche über das Mittelalter und die Renaissance bis in die Gegenwart* (Berlin, 2012); I. Nilsson and P. Stephenson, eds., *Wanted, Byzantium: The Desire for a Lost Empire* (Uppsala, 2014); P. Marciniak and D. C. Smythe, eds., *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500* (Farnham, Surrey, 2016).

7 See, for instance, L. Bréhier, "Le développement des études d'histoire byzantine du XVII^e au XX^e siècle," *Revue d'Auvergne* 18 (1901): 1–34; A. Heisenberg, "Die bisherige Entwicklung der byzantinischen Philologie und ihre künftigen Aufgaben," *Beilage zur allgemeinen Zeitung* 274 (1901): 1–5; E. Gerland, "Das Studium der byzantinischen Geschichte vom Humanismus bis zur Jetztzeit," *TFByzNgPhil* 12 (1934): 1–61; H.-G. Beck, "Die byzantinischen Studien in Deutschland vor Karl Krumbacher," in *ΧΑΛΙΚΕΣ: Festgabe für die Teilnehmer am XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongress, München 15.–20. September 1958*, ed. idem (Freising, 1958), 66–121; A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324–1453*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Madison, WI, 1958), 1:12–51. These studies emphasize the early modern (i.e., ca. 1500–1800) foundations of Byzantine scholarship, distinct from the much richer literature on the nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments in our discipline.

8 A. Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica e mondo bizantino* (Palermo, 1967).

by the tenth-century ceremonial treatise composed under Constantine VII, *De cerimoniis*.⁹ Yet Pseudo-Kodinos was a strikingly popular author in early modern Europe. The fortuitous discovery and publication of *De cerimoniis* in the late eighteenth century meant that for three centuries, any early modern scholar interested in the constitution or ritual of the Byzantine court consulted the idiosyncratic work of Pseudo-Kodinos. That significant numbers of scholars did so is attested by the rich early modern manuscript tradition, where Pseudo-Kodinos is preserved—whole or excerpted—in more than one hundred manuscripts from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. More importantly, the text was edited in two different recensions with extensive commentaries—one in the late sixteenth century and one in the early seventeenth century—well before most Byzantine texts had even been edited once.

This article focuses on the readings of the first two editors of Pseudo-Kodinos's treatise: the Reformed theologian Franciscus Junius and the Jesuit scholar Jakob Gretser. Examining their prefaces and commentaries will enable an exegetical analysis of the way scholars read and contested Pseudo-Kodinos.¹⁰ It lets us see how two dissimilar early modern intellectuals—from different religions, academic backgrounds, and parts

of Europe—read the same Byzantine text to divergent ends, instrumentalizing Byzantium for their diverse political, intellectual, and social agendas.

The ceremonial treatise spuriously attributed to the Constantinopolitan *kouropalates* George Kodinos, now known as Pseudo-Kodinos, preserves a unique record of the Palaiologan court's official hierarchy, elaborate official attire, and duties, as well as the numerous ceremonies that celebrated quotidian and special occasions in the life of the imperial court. Compiled sometime after John VI Kantakouzenos's coronation, the treatise is actually a pastiche of protocols from different periods of the Palaiologan court. Some of these ceremonies seem to date from the late thirteenth century, possibly to the reign of Michael VIII (e.g., chapter 11 on imperial mourning attire); others seem to have emerged from the 1340s, when Kantakouzenos was the *megas domestikos* (e.g., chapter 1 on the order of dignities).¹¹ Now the latest extant description of such practices, the treatise, however compilatory, is an invaluable record of the Palaiologan court soon after the civil war between John V Palaiologos and John VI Kantakouzenos. In twelve chapters, Pseudo-Kodinos describes the precedence, attire, and service of court offices before turning to a description of rituals for dominical feasts, like the Nativity, and occasional ceremonies, such as the coronation of the emperor or the promotion of imperial family members.¹²

The text itself is something of a cipher. The author's identity is uncertain: no prefatory or programmatic statements accompany the treatise; the protocols bear signs of having been compiled over time; and the

9 *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, ed. J. J. Reiske (Bonn, 1829–30); *Le livre des cérémonies: Constantin VII Porphyrogénète*, ed. and trans. A. Vogt (Paris, 1935–39; repr. Paris, 2006). The reasons that *De cerimoniis* displaced *De officiis* as the paradigmatic text of Byzantine ceremony probably have much to do with the contrasting authorial attributions—the former to a scholar-emperor, the latter to an anonymous courtier—as well as the divergent imperial trajectories at the moment of their respective creation. *De cerimoniis* represented the ascendancy of the Macedonian dynasty, *De officiis* the corruption of the late Byzantine state. For a worthwhile comparison, see the entries in K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches* (527–1453) (Munich, 1891), 61, 165–66. After praising the unexploited richness of *De cerimoniis*, Krumbacher regards Pseudo-Kodinos with bemusement: “Es berührt uns wie eine Ironie des Schicksals, dass all der massenhafte Flitterstaat, der ein Jahrtausend alte, verwickelte Apparat von Aemtern und Aemtchen, von Titeln, Vorschriften und Gepflogenheiten, die bald auf immer von der Weltbühne verschwinden sollten, noch in der Todesstunde des römischen Staates einer litterarischen Beachtung für würdig befunden wurde.”

10 For methodological reflections on the relatively unexploited value of neo-Latin commentaries, see K. Enenkel and H. Nellen, “Introduction: Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge,” in *Neo-Latin Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1400–1700)*, ed. eidem (Leuven, 2013), 1–77.

11 Jean Verpeaux's critical edition with French translation, *Pseudo-Kodinos: Traité des offices* (Paris, 1966), has recently been updated with a revised edition and English translation, accompanied by studies in R. Macrides, J. Munitiz, and D. Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan Court: Offices and Ceremonies* (Farnham, Surrey, 2013), though Verpeaux must still be consulted for the *apparatus criticus*. On the compilatory nature of the treatise and the origin of the various protocols, see Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, pp. 10–17; ch. 1 = pp. 26–34; ch. 11 = pp. 262–64. For older literature on Pseudo-Kodinos, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, 165–69, esp. 166; ODB 2:1135; PLP 6, no. 14082; Jean Verpeaux, “Hiérarchie et préséances sous les Paléologues,” *TM* 1 (1965): 421–37; A. Grabar, “Pseudo-Codinos et les cérémonies de la cour byzantine au XIV^e siècle,” in *Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues* (Venice, 1971), 195–221.

12 This division of the text reflects that of Verpeaux and Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov.

language is unpolished, often laconic, and sprinkled with abstruse vocabulary. In short, it is a rough piece of work in many ways.¹³ Nevertheless, the lists of precedence and descriptions of attire and ceremonies convey a good deal about Byzantine political theology, even if only indirectly, and retain the power to express the imperial majesty of the erstwhile state.

The treatise seems to have circulated fairly widely for a Byzantine text. In addition to the manuscripts, noted above, the text was printed in four editions between 1588 and 1648—more than almost any other Byzantine text at that time. The first two independent editions were those of Junius (1588) and Gretser (1625). In between, Junius prepared a reissue in 1596, which merely incorporated readings from additional, superior, manuscripts, while the fourth edition, prepared in 1648 by the French Jesuit Jacob Goar for the *Corpus Parisinum*, used essentially the same text as Gretser's 1625 edition, with a new preface and commentary, as well as some improved readings.¹⁴ Goar's edition proved definitive, for it was reprinted once in the eighteenth century, as well as twice in the nineteenth century: by Immanuel Bekker, as part of the Bonn Corpus, and by J.-P. Migne, as part of the *Patrologia Graeca*.¹⁵

13 See the thorough introduction in Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 1–20. A hallmark of Pseudo-Kodinos are his confessions of uncertainty: R. Macrides, “The reason is not known.” Remembering and Recording the Past: Pseudo-Kodinos as an Historian,” in *L'écriture de la mémoire: La littérature de l'historiographie*, ed. P. Odorico, P. Agapitos, and M. Hinterberger (Paris, 2006), 317–30.

14 F. Junius, *Τὸ σοφωτάτου Κουροπαλάτου περὶ τῶν ὀφφικιάλων τοῦ παλατίου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῶν ὀφφικίων τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας—Sapientissimi Curopalatae, De officialibus palatii Constantinopolitani, et officiis Magnae Ecclesiae . . .* ([Heidelberg], 1588); F. Junius, *Γεωργίου τοῦ Κωδίνου περὶ τῶν ὀφφικιάλων τοῦ παλατίου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ τῶν ὀφφικίων τῆς μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας—Georgii Codini (sive, ut vulgo, Curopalatae) de officialibus Palatii Constantinopolitani et officiis magnae Ecclesiae . . .* ([Heidelberg], 1596); J. Gretser, *Georgius Codinus Curopalata De officiis et officialibus magnae ecclesiae et aule Constantinopolitane . . .* (Paris, 1625); J. Goar, *Georgius Codinus Curopalata De officiis et officialibus magnae ecclesiae et aule Constantinopolitane, ex versione P. Jacobi Gretseri . . .* (Paris, 1648). All four editions were printed with facing Latin translations.

15 On the manuscripts of Pseudo-Kodinos, see Verpeaux, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 41–113; Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 21–24. The only previous scholarship on these early printed editions of Pseudo-Kodinos is J. Verpeaux, “Les premières éditions du *Traité des offices* du Pseudo-Codinos et les humanistes d'Augsbourg et d'Heidelberg,” *BSI* 25 (1964): 37–51, which is particularly strong on the sixteenth-century background and the manuscripts used by

Jean Verpeaux, in research for his edition of Pseudo-Kodinos, did excellent work in identifying the manuscripts used by these two editors of Pseudo-Kodinos. Yet his research pursued only the most general consideration of the intellectual, cultural, and political conditions for this recondite scholarship, even though he himself obliquely observed that “erudite research is not gratuitous; it responds mostly to certain specific concerns, not only to a general appetite for knowledge.”¹⁶ In order, then, to truly understand the way Pseudo-Kodinos—or any Byzantine text—was read in early modern Europe, we need to know not only which manuscripts scholars consulted but which *préoccupations précises*, to use Verpeaux's phrase, impelled them. This final aim is all the more important, as the two figures examined in this paper fall precisely between the two most-studied efflorescences of Byzantine scholarship—in Augsburg in the 1550s and 1560s, and in Paris from the 1640s. That is, the readings of Junius and Gretser provide some much-needed landmarks in surveying the expanse of Byzantine scholarship between Wolf and Labbe.

From the Calvinist bulwark of late sixteenth-century Heidelberg, to the Counter-Reformation hothouse of a Jesuit college in Ingolstadt, Junius and Gretser illustrate how their intellectual commitments shaped the diverse ways they read Pseudo-Kodinos and made sense of Byzantine ceremony. Framed by the irenic politics of the wars of religion, or the polemics of the Counter-Reformation, these two scholars made Byzantine ceremony legible and relevant to their own worlds, and thereby contested the very meaning of the Byzantine past.

Junius, Gretser, and Goar in their editions; Verpeaux is less attentive to the political, intellectual, and religious circumstances of the production of each edition. The eighteenth-century edition of Pseudo-Kodinos: *Georgius Codinus Curopalata De officiis et officialibus magnae ecclesiae et aule Constantinopolitane, ex versione P. Jacobi Gretseri . . .* (Venice, 1739); the nineteenth-century editions: *Codini Curopalatae De officialibus palatii Cpolitani et de officiis magnae Ecclesiae Liber*, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1839), and *Georgii Codini De officiis magnae ecclesiae et aule Cpolitana Liber*, in PG 157:17–428.

16 Verpeaux, “Les premières éditions,” 42 n. 27: “En dépit du caractère humaniste du XVI^e siècle, la recherche érudite n'est pas gratuite; elle répond la plupart du temps à des préoccupations précises et pas seulement à un appétit général de savoir.”

Byzantine Studies in the Late Sixteenth Century

The second half of the sixteenth century was primed for engagement with Pseudo-Kodinos and Byzantine ceremony, as the historical, philological, cultural, and theological currents of the age made readers newly receptive to such a text. First, earnest travelers to the foreign shores of the Byzantine Middle Ages had as a guide the recent publication of Byzantine historians edited and translated by Wolf.¹⁷ These four volumes laid out for the first time in print with Latin translation the whole arc of Byzantine history, from the first Constantine to the last, and subsequent scholars made heavy use of them. In addition to this historical aid, an eager student could increasingly call upon lexicographical resources, as well. Wolf, himself a consummate Hellenist who had cut his teeth editing Demosthenes, had recognized the postclassical quality of the Greek and had called for those “with knowledge of the corrupted language” (*corruptae linguae periti*) to compile a dictionary for navigating such texts. His injunction was eventually pursued by lexicographers like Bonaventura Vulcanius and Nicolas Rigaultius, who compiled early word lists from Byzantine theological and tactical treatises, and whose lexica would be used by Gretser.¹⁸

17 These volumes, edited by Wolf, presented the histories of John Zonaras, Niketas Choniates, Nikephoros Gregoras, and Laonikos Chalkokondyles (only the Latin translation published in 1556 by Conrad Clauser) as a unified whole. On the mid-sixteenth-century receptiveness to Pseudo-Kodinos, see Verpeaux, “Les premières éditions,” 37–42. On Wolf, see Beck, “Die byzantinischen Studien in Deutschland,” 75–78; A. Ben-Tov, *Lutheran Humanists and Greek Antiquity: Melanchthonian Scholarship between Universal History and Pedagogy* (Leiden, 2009), 106–9, where the author convincingly argues that we should doubt the attribution of the title *Corpus universae historiae byzantinae* to Wolf and ascribe it to the printer Oporinus, instead; D. R. Reinsch, “Hieronymus Wolf as Editor and Translator of Byzantine Texts,” in *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500*, ed. P. Marciniak and D. C. Smythe (Farnham, Surrey, 2016), 43–53. These were not the first historians of the Byzantine world edited in the sixteenth century—editions of Prokopios (1531) and ecclesiastical historians like Sozomen and Sokrates (1544) preceded them by some years; see Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica*, 40; D. Reinsch, “Edition und Rezeption byzantinischen Historiker durch deutsche Humanisten,” in *Graeca recentiora in Germania: Deutsch-griechische Kulturbeziehungen vom 15. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. H. Eideneier (Wiesbaden, 1994), 51–52.

18 Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 251–53.

Alongside the burgeoning interest in Byzantine historiography and lexicography, scholars and travelers had also looked to the Ottoman Empire, a powerful catalyst for the efforts of early Byzantine editors such as Wolf.¹⁹ In 1584, only four years before the first edition of Pseudo-Kodinos, the Tübingen theologian and ethnographer Martin Crusius published his *Turcograecia*, a collection of documents, letters, and travel reports concerning the Greek community under the Ottomans. Meanwhile, the Holy Roman Empire, whose capital had moved eastward to Prague with the ascension of Rudolf II, was at once a bastion against the Turks and a gateway eastward for voyagers, many of whom traveled on official missions or at least supported the imperial cause.²⁰

If European princes chiefly saw peril in Constantinople, some theologians saw possibilities, as concord with the churches of the Christian East beckoned. Crusius himself followed the naïve Lutheran overtures of Philip Melanchthon and others a generation earlier in seeking a rapprochement with the patriarch of Constantinople.²¹ Such missions may have been chimerical, but they indicate the degree to which scholars saw the territories and texts of Eastern Christianity as rich with possibility.²²

19 See, for instance, the rhetoric of prophylaxis in Wolf’s *Epilogus Byzantinae Historiae*, in *Nicephori Gregorae, Romanae, hoc est Byzantinae historiae Libri XI* (Basel, 1562), and the preface to C. Clauser, *Laonici Chalcocondylae Atheniensis, de origine et rebus gestis Turcorum Libri Decem* (Basel, 1556), which propound the didactic value of Byzantine history for those who aim to unite against the Turks.

20 Among those who claimed a deep knowledge of both Ottoman and Byzantine texts and culture was the legal scholar Johannes Leunclavius (d. 1594). R. J. W. Evans, “Bohemia, the Emperor, and the Porte, 1550–1600,” *OSP* 3 (1970): 88–89.

21 See S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (London, 1968), 238–58; Ben-Tov, *Lutheran Humanists and Greek Antiquity*, 109–23. For an adumbration of some of the lesser-known intersections between Lutheranism and the Orthodox Church, see the essays in E. Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz: Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation und der östlich-orthodoxen Kirche* (Marburg, 1949).

22 On some of the opportunities perceived by German humanists, specifically, see A. Ben-Tov, “Turco-Graecia: German Humanists and the End of Greek Antiquity—Cultural Exchange and Misunderstanding,” in *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*, ed. A. Contadini and C. Norton (Farnham, Surrey, 2013), 181–95.

A Reformed Reading: Franciscus Junius and an Irenic Byzantium

The first to edit and translate Pseudo-Kodinos was the Reformed theologian and biblical scholar Franciscus Junius.²³ Born in 1545 in Bourges, the famous center of French legal humanism, Junius studied law under the tutelage of François Le Douaren and Hugues Doneau, both disciples of the great jurist Andrea Alciato. From these scholars, Junius learned the historical-philological approach of the *mos gallicus*, the predominant methodology in legal studies then flourishing in France.²⁴ Later he imbibed the theology of Calvin and began his study of Hebrew in Geneva. Called to preach, Junius found himself driven by national and confessional persecutions from one community to another. His peripatetic life did not prevent him from making a crucial contribution to the biblical scholarship of the sixteenth century, for in 1573 he began work with the renowned Hebraist Immanuel Tremellius on a new Reformed translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew. Drawing on their knowledge of Semitic languages and Tremellius's long career as a teacher of Hebrew and the Old Testament, the two scholars produced a new translation in five volumes that would go on to enjoy great success throughout Europe over the

next two centuries.²⁵ In 1584 Junius found some measure of stability when he took up a post teaching theology at the university in Heidelberg, a haven for the Reformed worshippers in the Holy Roman Empire.²⁶

In the preface to Junius's first edition of Pseudo-Kodinos from 1588, these intellectual, political, and religious currents are evident in clear programmatic statements.²⁷ Junius claims that there are three things about which almost all people disagree and over which learned men argue among themselves: "the history of the church, the history of the law, and the common history of all people."²⁸ Junius sees the clear exposition of ceremonies, offices, and administrative matters as indispensable to an ultimate solution to this persistent discord. And not only these histories—this *libellus*, Junius claims, represents a way to bridge other fundamental historical binaries: Greek and Latin, ancient and modern, civil and ecclesiastical.²⁹ Junius

23 Junius wrote his own *vita*, which he published in his *Opera Theologica*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1607), 1:6–22; for the translation and a brief biographical sketch, see F. Junius, *A Treatise on True Theology: With the Life of Franciscus Junius*, trans. D. C. Noe (Grand Rapids, MI, 2014); E. and E. Haag, *La France protestante*, 2nd ed., vol. 5 (Paris, 1886), cols. 711–26, which includes his bibliography, noting of Pseudo-Kodinos, "[t]ravail peu estimé" (col. 720). More thorough than the Haags is Fr. W. Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor, 1545–1602: Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Schriften und Briefe* (Amsterdam, 1891), which discusses his edition of Pseudo-Kodinos and includes the most exhaustive bibliography, including manuscript and no longer extant works. The only extensive modern study is T. Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä. (1545–1602): Ein reformierter Theologe im Spannungsfeld zwischen späthumanistischer Irenik und reformierter Konfessionalisierung* (Göttingen, 2007), which portrays Junius as a complex figure embodying two powerful late sixteenth-century intellectual trends, but does not discuss his edition of Pseudo-Kodinos.

24 See D. R. Kelley, "Civil Science in the Renaissance: Jurisprudence in the French Manner," *History of European Ideas* 2, no. 4 (1981): 261–76. As Kelley points out, the origins of this methodological disposition were political—to deny the validity of imperial authority and the "emperor's law" in France and elevate their own national legal tradition.

25 The first edition of the work, *Biblorum partes I–V* (Frankfurt, 1575–79), was almost immediately reprinted elsewhere, such as London, Geneva, and Amsterdam, often in conjunction with Tremellius's translation of the New Testament from Syriac. On their translation of the Old Testament, see K. Austin, *From Judaism to Calvinism: The Life and Writings of Immanuel Tremellius (c. 1510–1580)* (Aldershot, Hampshire, 2007), 145–67, esp. 146–47, where he argues, against more recent scholarship, that the translation as a whole was a joint project but that Tremellius was the senior partner.

26 After the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, the principle *Cuius regio, eius religio* obtained in the Holy Roman Empire—although the Reformed confession was not technically accorded sanction—meaning that the "religion" of the Palatinate and Heidelberg vacillated according to the confession of the ruler. Under Frederick III, the Palatinate was Reformed; after his death, under Louis IV, it was Lutheran; after Louis's death, the Palatinate was Reformed once again. The biographical sketch here is drawn from his *vita*. Junius does not, however, mention where he studied Arabic and Syriac.

27 This letter is addressed to the "noblest men, most honorable lords, lords consuls and the illustrious senate of the republic of Frankfurt" from Nadabus Agmonius, Junius's name rendered in Hebrew, probably a learned puzzle for the erudite to solve. Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalate*, A2: "Nobilissimis viris, dominis amplissimis, dominis consulibus ac senatui inclityæ Reipubl. Francofurdensis, Nabadus Agmonius S. P." In what was perhaps intended as a hint, Junius cites himself by name, referring not to one of his printed works but to his school, probably meaning his lectures: "quam rem copiose nuper Fr. Junius in Academica sua observavit." (246). All translations in this article are mine unless otherwise noted.

28 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalate*, A2v–A3: "historia Ecclesiæ, historia iuris; et historia communis omnium."

29 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalate*, A2v: "hic libellus (quantulus autem?) communis est σύλλαβος sive indiculus comparandæ et coniungendæ historiæ Græcæ et Latinæ, veteris et novæ, civilis

repeats and expands this view of Pseudo-Kodinos as a historical aid. “How familiarly he sets out the matters of the imperial household, the people, the courts, the military, the offices of war and peace, the insignias and the ceremonies. Whoever understands all these things has the greatest advantage in reading Greek and Latin history.”³⁰ Junius notably inverts the famous dictum of his compatriot Jean Bodin—also trained in the *mos gallicus*—who wrote in his *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* that “the better part of universal law lies in history.”³¹ Bodin’s treatise detailed the exploitation of history in the service of a comparative legal and ultimately political inquiry into the best forms of governance, a project that sought to dislodge the hegemony of Roman legal and historical precedents. For Junius, the study of history does not elucidate or reveal the technical discipline, as it did for Bodin, but the other way around: the explication of ceremony and hierarchy are indispensable to understanding first “Greek history” and then the *historia communis omnium*, a true universal history that encompasses the affairs of church and state, and unites both Greek and Latin traditions.

Junius’s preface emphasizes ascendant strains of imperial ideology in the sixteenth century, as well. “Knowledge of the Eastern Empire and its structure cannot be useless to those who are engaged in the Holy Western Empire, where this flourishing republic of yours [Frankfurt] has had no meager place up to now on account of its merit,” Junius avers.³² This declaration of utility was more than simple rhetorical

association. Frankfurt had been the site of imperial coronations since 1562, making the city a locus of empire in the West and an analogue to Rome, which it had displaced as imperial *proscenium*.³³ Addressing his dedication to, among others, the “lords, consuls and senate of Frankfurt” only heightened this imperial evocation.³⁴ Notable, as well, is his language of empire. The term *imperium orientale* gestures toward an idea that had gained dramatically in relevance since the reign of Maximilian I: that the Byzantine Empire represented not the imperial husk left behind by the *translatio imperii* from Irene to Charlemagne in 800, but a legitimate, imperial state separated from the West in a division of the Roman Empire—and that it was the destiny of the Holy Roman Empire to reunite the fractured whole.³⁵

eos qui in hoc S. Imperio Occidentali versantur, ubi florentissima hæc vestra Respubl. iamdiu merito suo non infimum locum obtinet.”

33 The first coronation in Frankfurt, that of Maximilian II, was an impromptu response to the death of the archbishop of Cologne, though it attained such primacy afterward that coronations elsewhere required assurances to Frankfurt that the city’s rights were not being abrogated. See H.-O. Schembs, “Frankfurt als Wahl- und Krönungsstadt der deutschen Könige und Kaiser,” in *Deutsche Hauptstädte—von Frankfurt nach Berlin*, ed. B. Heidenreich (Wiesbaden, 1998), 34–36.

34 This edition’s dedication was not the only connection between Frankfurt and Byzantium; Wolf’s texts were reprinted (in Latin translation only) twice over the next decade: *Corpus Historiae Byzantinae* (Frankfurt, 1568), and *Historia Rerum in Oriente Gestarum* (Frankfurt, 1587). See Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica* (n. 8 above), 56–57.

35 A few examples of this emphasis on reunion of the divided empire which emerged in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: Sebastian Brant’s pamphlet on the recent birth of conjoined twins in Worms in 1495, in R. W. Scheller, “Imperial Themes in Art and Literature of the Early French Renaissance: The Period of Charles VIII,” *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 12, no. 1 (1981/82): 44–45; Maximilian I’s letter to Willibald Pirckheimer requesting that he translate into Latin the recently discovered manuscript of Zonaras’s *Ἐπιτομή ἱστοριῶν* (now Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. hist. gr. 16), in *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, ed. E. Reicke, vol. 2 (Munich, 1956), no. 328, pp. 454–56; the entry on Constantinople in Maximilian’s heraldry book, in A. Coreth, “Ein Wappenbuch Kaiser Maximilians I,” *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchiv* 2 (1949): 297; Mercurio Gattinara’s oration after Charles V’s election as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519, in P. F. Hane, *Historia Sacrorum a B. Luthero emendatorum* (Leipzig, 1729), 217; Johannes Cuspinianus’s exhortation to Emperor Maximilian I, in J. Cuspinianus, *De Caesaribus atque Imperatoribus Romanis* ([Strasbourg], 1540), 636. It is noteworthy that even a sixteenth-century historian like Carlo Sigonio, historically scrupulous enough to preserve Eusebius’s account of Constantine I’s reign—which

et Ecclesiasticæ.” On the etymology of σύλλαβος (used here in the sense of compilation), a faux archaism based on a corrupted reading of one of Cicero’s letters to Atticus, see the concise summary in *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1989), s.v., *syllabus*. On *indiculus* (a letter which instructs or indicates), see Charles Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1678), 2: cols. 49–50, s.v. *indiculus*.

30 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalate*, A3r–v: “Aulica, popularia, forensia, militaria, belli et pacis officia, insignia, ritus ut exponit familiariter! Quæ omnia qui assequitur, maximam legendis historiis Græcis et Latinis commoditatem obtinet.”

31 J. Bodin, *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, ed. and trans. S. Miglietti (Pisa, 2013), 78; idem, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, trans. B. Reynolds (New York, 1966), 8. Bodin lays out the intentions of his project in the prefatory letter to Jean Tessier.

32 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalate*, A4v: “deinde vero quia non potest inutilis esse Imperii Orientalis et formæ illius cognitio apud

This was an idea all the more provocative for its uneasy and insoluble tension with the theory of the *translatio imperii* on which German imperial legitimacy had traditionally rested. Junius possibly derived this usage from the polemical treatise of Matthias Flacius Illyricus, the *animus* behind the great collaborative ecclesiastical history of the Lutherans, the *Magdeburg Centuries*, and an inveterate controversialist.³⁶ Flacius's treatise *De translatione imperii romani* constituted a sharp rebuke of the papal theory of the translation of empire, identifying Charlemagne's coronation and subsequent assumption of the *imperium occidentale* in 800 as a concession of the emperor in Constantinople rather than a revocable grant from the papacy. His theory was tendentious and Junius, at the end of his own life, defended Flacius against Catholic attack.³⁷ In what appears a rhetorical aside, then, Junius recapitulates a powerful element of Western imperial ideology in the post-Byzantine period—that the ideological capital of Byzantium, its claim to Roman imperial

contradicted the legend of the Donation of Constantine—over the objections of Catholic censors, both embraces the *translatio imperii* to the Franks and still adopts the terminology of the divided empire: C. Sigonio, *Historiarum de occidentali imperio libri XX* (Basel, 1579); on Sigonio's disputes with Catholic censors, see W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio: The Changing World of the Late Renaissance* (Princeton, 1989), 251–90. Sigonio eventually relented and grudgingly included the Donation, relying on the Byzantine authorities Balsamon, Kalekas, and Scholarios (265 n. 29). The late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century call for a *restitutio imperii*, especially among German humanists, has been noted by others: J. Ridé, *L'Image du Germain dans la pensée et la littérature allemandes de la redécouverte de Tacite à la fin du XVI^e siècle: Contribution à l'étude de la genèse d'un mythe* (Lille, 1977), 2:975–81; A. Y. Haran, *Le lys et le globe: Messianisme dynastique et rêve impérial en France à l'aube des temps modernes* (Seyssel, 2000), 66–67. The ideological importance of the *imperium orientale* in this program has not yet received the same attention.

36 For the *Centuries*, of which only thirteen of the sixteen planned volumes were published, see *Ecclesiastica Historia*, 13 vols. (Basel, 1559–74); on Flacius and his historical vision, see I. Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378–1615)* (Leiden, 2003), 343–74.

37 Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *De translatione imperii Romani ad Germanos* (Basel, 1566), 8, 53–54; Werner Goetz, *Translatio imperii: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorien im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen, 1958), 293–304. Flacius's treatise elicited a rebuttal from Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, *De translatione imperii Romani a Graecis ad Francos* (Cologne, 1599), esp. 143–55; in response to Bellarmine, Junius composed his defense of Flacius: *Animadversiones ad Tres Libros de Translatione Imperii Rom. Roberti Bellarmini*, in *Opera Theologica* (n. 23 above), 2: cols. 883–986, esp. 952–55.

authority and legitimacy, here represented by its ceremony, could and indeed should be appropriated by the Holy Roman Empire.

Junius's ambitious vision of historical and imperial concord notwithstanding, a Byzantine ceremonial manual may seem an odd choice for a scholar who had primarily devoted his energies to theological works and scriptural exegesis.³⁸ According to Junius's more famous son-in-law, Gerardus Johannes Vossius, it was because Junius “loved the antiquity of the church” that he was inspired to edit and translate this text for the first time.³⁹ Perhaps so, but Junius is more explicit in describing his own motives. It was his expertise in Semitic languages, especially Hebrew, attested in his work with Tremellius on their translation of the Bible, that qualified Junius to take up this edition. Noting that Wolf had a copy of Pseudo-Kodinos in the library at Augsburg, Junius observes that Wolf,

put off by the difficulty and obscurity of language, sentiment, and subject, not only

38 Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere* (n. 23 above), 273–74, claims that Junius also prepared notes, preserved in manuscript (or perhaps added to his own copy), on Thomas Magistros's lexicon of Attic Greek, which was published in a number of editions after its *editio princeps*, *Θωμά τοῦ μαγίστρου κατὰ ἀλφάβητον, ἀτθίδος διαλέκτου ἐκλογαί* (Rome, 1517). He relies on the 1757 imprint edited by J. S. Bernard, *Θωμά τοῦ μαγίστρου Κατ' ἀλφάβητον ὀνοματῶν αττικῶν ἐκλογαί* (Leiden, 1757), which adds extensive footnotes adducing the animadversions of other famous Hellenists of previous centuries. In his preface, Bernard mentions “Fr. Junii” among the authors whose “parvas . . . notulas ac conjecturas” he has added to his notes (4r–v). However, fully two-thirds of his citations that mention Junius cite Hadrianus Junius, another sixteenth-century scholar who actually was a classical lexicographer—and unrelated to Franciscus Junius. The other third are labeled simply “Junii.” Therefore, we should be skeptical about whether our Junius had ever encountered or commented upon Magistros's lexicographical work.

39 G. J. Vossius, *Benigno Lectori*, in *De historicis latinis libri tres* (Leiden, 1627), fol. **v: “Ecclesiasticam amaret antiquitatem”; Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere*, 91. A large portion of Vossius's prefatory letter is dedicated to an apologetic for Junius (not coincidentally, as Vossius was married to Junius's daughter), against the dismissive critique of the French historian Jacques-Auguste de Thou, who had called Junius *vir desultorio ingenio* in his *Historiarum sui temporis*, vol. 5 (Geneva, 1620), bk. 127, 1013C. Vossius calls as witness against de Thou the elegiac couplets composed by Scaliger upon Junius's death, poetic praise judged all the more honest given Scaliger's savage criticisms of Junius during his lifetime. For examples, see *Scaligerana* (Cologne, 1667), 131–32; for context, see A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2, *Historical Chronology* (Oxford, 1993), 375–76, 437–38.

abstained from it, but indeed longed for someone else to unbar this text like a sanctuary with a knowledge of foreign languages. . . . For how many languages there are, obscured by age, made difficult by novelty, strange in form and origin: Hebrew, Chaldaean, Syriac, Arabic, Turkish, Greek, Latin, Germanic, Gallic, Italian, and others.⁴⁰

Junius's fellow professor at Leiden, Justus Lipsius, would later praise his edition for this very linguistic breadth.⁴¹

Junius thus gives priority in his commentary to the philological intricacies of the text: most of his notes offer simple lexical explanations of the Greek terms.⁴² After his self-satisfied declarations of linguistic competence in the preface, it is no surprise that Junius

particularly relishes identifying the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish influences in Pseudo-Kodinos. Some of these notes demonstrate impressive linguistic and cultural range. In a note on the Greek word *σαλιβαν*, which he simply transliterates *salibam*, Junius correctly observes, "It is the Arabic name of a military club, which they call *Tzalibam* in their language, as do the Turks now as well."⁴³ But this zeal for Semitic etymology occasionally leads him astray, as well. In emending *ἀρχων τοῦ ἀλλαγίου* to *ἀρχων τοῦ ἀλογίου*, Junius proposes an etymological derivation from the Hebrew word *halac* to justify his unwarranted emendation and explain the role of this courtier as a commander of a squadron of knights.⁴⁴ Elsewhere his lack of familiarity with Byzantine history and culture betrays him. When Pseudo-Kodinos enumerates the four vigils held in the palace every year, Junius explains that the *Akathistos* vigil is so called because Mary made her journey to Bethlehem while pregnant without sitting or resting, an error that illustrates his limited knowledge of the hymn and its significance in the Orthodox liturgy.⁴⁵

Nevertheless, it can be too easy to criticize our historical and philological forerunners who worked with imperfect editions, corrupt and lacunose manuscripts, and almost no *Hilfsmittel*—and we must acknowledge that Junius had moments of very solid historical-philological scholarship. To begin, he acknowledges

40 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, A3v–4: "sed argumenti, sententiarum, vocum obscuritate et asperitate deterritus non solum abstinuit ipse, verumetiam alterius desideravit manum qui hoc velut, adytum reseraret linguarum exterarum intelligentia. . . . Nam voces sunt quam plurimae vetustate obsitae, novitate asperae, origine et forma alienae, Hebraeae, Chaldaeae, Syrae, Arabicae, Turcicae, Graecae, Latinae, Germanicae, Gallicae, Italicae, etc." Wolf had acknowledged some familiarity with the text in his notes to the *editio princeps* of Niketas Choniates, in which, defending his choice of *cubicularium* as a translation for *προκοίτων*, he lamented that the dignities and offices of the Byzantine court remained insufficiently understood even by the clever young man then working on an edition, Raphael Seyler. See the "Variae Lectiones et Annotationes in Nicetae Choniatae Historiam," in H. Wolf, *Nicetae Acominati Choniatae, Magni Logothete Secretorum. . . LXXXVI annorum historia* (Basel, 1557), no. 6 (fol. D4). On Seyler, see Verpeaux, "Les premières éditions" (n. 15 above), 39–40; L. Ștefănescu, "Codex Codinensis — Georgios Kodinos dans le manuscrit de Raphaël Seyler," in *Actes du XIV^e congrès international des études byzantines, Bucarest, 6–12 septembre 1971*, ed. M. Berza and E. Stănescu, vol. 3 (Bucharest, 1976), 151–56.

41 Ep. 665 (6 December 1588), in *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, vol. 3, 1588–1590, ed. S. Sué and H. Peeters (Brussels, 1987), 149–50; Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere*, 93–94. Interestingly, Scaliger, too, seemed satisfied with Junius's editorial work; his general approbation was a marked departure from the brutal criticisms of Junius's editions of Manilius and Tertullian. See his letter to Jan Dousa on 19 March 1596, wherein he commends the usefulness of Junius's edition and further observes that he would be gratified by a history of the "recentiorum Constantinopoleos Caesarum": *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, ed. P. Botley and D. van Miert (Geneva, 2012), 2:613–15. Scaliger had his own annotated copy of Junius's 1596 edition, now in the Leiden University Library, 755 F 26: 2.

42 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 244–339; these are indexed by folio and line number of the Latin translation, rather than the Greek.

43 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 281: "Nomen Arabicum est militaris clavae: quam illi *Tzalibam* suo sermone vocant et Turci quoque hodierno die." See Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos* (n. 11 above), 63 n. 94, for the editors' note on this subject, confirming Junius's incisive judgment here.

44 *Halac* means "he goes/went" in Hebrew. Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 282–83; cf. Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 30, 64, 108. The heavily corrupted manuscript Junius used, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. gr. 414, gives the reading *ἀλλαγίου* at fols. 9r, 23v, and *ἀλαγίου* at 41v; *ἀλογίου* is not attested in any other manuscript. On the office of the *ἀρχων τοῦ ἀλλαγίου*, see R. Guiland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1967), 1:524–26, where he mentions this misreading and the subsequent confusion it caused, but attributes it to the subsequent editors of Pseudo-Kodinos, Gretser and Goar (n. 49, p. 532).

45 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, fol. 328; cf. Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 180. Gretser, in his own edition of Pseudo-Kodinos, takes Junius to task at great length for his failure to understand the origin of the term *akathistos* (*Georgius Codinus*, 248). This misunderstanding suggests strongly that Junius had never read the hymn; see E. Wellesz, "The 'Akathistos': A Study in Byzantine Hymnography," *DOP* 9–10 (1956): 141–74, esp. 151–52, on the passage which explains the name.

that obscurity evident in both the language and the substance of Pseudo-Kodinos emerged not from “corruption” or some cultural decay, but from an idiosyncratic admixture of antiquity, novelty, and “foreignness” (*peregrinitas*).⁴⁶ These three principles shape his approach to commentary as he strives to parse the old from the new, the native from the foreign. These are frequently purely philological and linguistic gymnastics, espying (or hallucinating) Arabic and Hebrew etymologies, but occasionally such distinctions rely on his historical sensibility. On the *Magnus Contostaulos*, he concludes that the term derived most recently from the Byzantine *dux copiarum auxiliarum*, who led mercenaries from the West and took his name from them. But by *Franci*, the *recentiores Graeci* mean not only men from “Gallia,” but Italians and Sicilians, as well, “since the kingdom of Sicily and part of Italy were held in those days by the Franks.”⁴⁷

The commentary also provides ample testimony that Junius brought little knowledge of Byzantine history or culture to his editorial task beyond his apparent familiarity with Wolf’s editions of Byzantine historians, which Junius cites most frequently, adding to these George Kedrenos, a twelfth-century historian who wrote a universal history from creation to 1057.⁴⁸ Meanwhile, he makes only passing reference to writers from the patristic or classical tradition. But when Ammianus Marcellinus or Varro, Cyprian or Augustine appear, it is not to show the reader where in these authors corroborative passages might be found, but merely to assure him that these names, as essentialized authorities, agree with the editor.⁴⁹

Other than Byzantine historians, the literary tradition on which Junius draws most heavily is late Roman law. These references demonstrate both the

thoroughness and the method of his education in Bourges. Indeed, the historicity of these laws, their origins in the late Roman Empire, help Junius to illustrate the continuities between late Roman and Byzantine imperial offices. In his explanation of the duties of the *chartoularios*—“managing and revising public documents, accounts, and records”—Junius employs the novel of Leo I and Anthemius to illustrate that both the title and the duties of the Byzantine courtier originated in the late Roman Empire.⁵⁰ Such definitions constitute more than simple etymology; they also strengthen the link between the Roman Empire of late antiquity and the imperial state in Constantinople that Junius posited in his preface.

More meaningful than what Junius includes in his commentary are those things which he omits. Absent are the standard, almost rote, denigrations of the religion, institutions, and political theology of Byzantium that appear in plenty of other works of sixteenth-century Byzantine scholarship. For instance, the veneration of icons—so abhorred by Calvin—featured prominently in the ceremony on Christmas Eve, during which cantors sing “Many years” to the emperor while he kisses the icons.⁵¹ But this passage and others where he so venerates icons elicit no commentary from Junius.⁵² Nor does he elsewhere exploit the opportunity provided by his commentary to impugn the “schismatic” religion of the Byzantines, as did many of his contemporaries.⁵³

50 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 259–60: “*Chartularius*] ὁ χαρτουλάριος, qui publicis literis, tabulis, instrumentisque curandis et retractandis constitutus est, ut Leo et Anthemius Imp. loquuntur l.3.C. de canone larg. titul. [i.e., *CIC CI* 10.23.3].” For other titles and practices which he roots in Roman law, see p. 264 (on the practice of kissing the emperor’s foot; *CIC CI* 12.17, *De domesticis et protectoribus*); p. 295 (on the origin of the title *Magnus Contostaulos*; *CIC CI* 12.11, *De comitibus et tribunis scholarum*); p. 301 (on the origin of the title *Magnus Pappias*; *CIC CI* 9.4, *De custodia reorum*).

51 See, for instance, J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* 1.11, which sets out his arguments against images in Christian worship. For the ceremonies on Christmas Eve, see Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 120, 124.

52 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 85–86, 89–90. In his *vita*, Junius condemns the actions of a group of iconoclasts destroying Catholic churches in Ghent and throughout Flanders, saying “I never approved of violence and disorder of this sort” (*Nunquam mihi profecto violenta eiusmodi et ἀτακτα consilia placuerunt*): Junius, *Vita*, in *Opera Theologica* (n. 23 above), 1:17.

53 By no means a sixteenth-century phenomenon: see H. Hunger, *Graeculus perfidus*—*Ἰταλὸς ἱταμός*: *Il senso dell’alterità nei rapporti*

46 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 243: “*Insolentes in sermone voces, res non minus abstrusæ. Difficultatis istius in causa sunt antiquitas, novitas, peregrinitas: quæ tria sermoni vitium, rei obscuritatem afferre solent.*”

47 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 296–97: “*Franci autem in recentiorum Graecorum scriptis (quæ res fefellit plurimos) non Galli solum intellegendi sunt, sed Itali quoque et Siculi; eo quod Sicilia regnum illis temporibus et pars Italie a Francis tenebatur.*”

48 See, for instance, Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 245, 272, 290, etc. Kedrenos was edited by W. Xylander, *Annales, sive Historiae ab exordio mundi . . .* (Basel, 1566).

49 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 258, 276 (Ammianus Marcellinus); 254 (Varro); 255 (Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine).

Other omissions speak less to his forbearance than to his inexperience. Unlike other editors—Wolf, for instance, as well as earlier editors and writers on Byzantine subjects—Junius demonstrates no familiarity with the abundant manuscript sources on Byzantine history. And for all his claims to illuminate the text with a knowledge of Eastern languages, he exhibits no interest in or knowledge of the extensive ethnographic and historical literature on the Turks produced over the course of over a century between Theodore Gaza (d. 1475) and Martin Crusius (d. 1607). So, while Junius framed Pseudo-Kodinos as a kind of missing link between disparate traditions, one which would enable scholars to read histories in a new way, the commentator rarely realizes this supposed potential. The radiance of enlightenment largely shines in the other direction—from those histories (largely Wolf's editions) onto Pseudo-Kodinos. In fact, despite his bold prefatory declarations, Junius himself seems to have known but little about those binary traditions—ancient and modern, civil and ecclesiastical—that Pseudo-Kodinos was supposed to unify. For Junius, at least, the ceremonial book was less a key than a code.

Perhaps his most striking omission, however, is what stands at the heart of the text—the ceremonies. His commentary lingers over the first several chapters of Pseudo-Kodinos, which include the list of precedence, the official attire, and the duties of the individual courtiers. These chapters constitute no more than a third of the text but absorb three-quarters of the editor's notes. But when Pseudo-Kodinos turns to the elaborate ceremonies for feast days, coronations, and promotions, Junius turns laconic. Of the extensive description of the meal on Christmas Day, during which the *megas domestikos* serves the emperor and summons all the office holders to receive plates of food, Junius offers only a few notes: he defines the *domestikos tou domestikeiou*; he explains, rightly, that the plates are placed first upon the floor; he speculates that τὸ μινσάλιον derives from a corruption of a Latin term. But he has nothing to say about the actual ceremony, the emperor's meal, and the

ritual distribution of plates.⁵⁴ Junius remains within the fastness of his own knowledge here, which is neither broad nor deep. The ceremonies of the Byzantine court are too rich, too complex, for his narrow, philological hermeneutic. The result is that his commentary, indeed his view of Pseudo-Kodinos and his protocols, then, is glossarial—full of definition but signifying little.

What, then, does this narrow, pedantic reading of Byzantine ceremony tell us? First, it shows how Junius made sense of Byzantium according to his idiosyncratic intellectual training. His philological approach to the text, while falling short of particularly incisive exegesis, reveals the influence of the French school of jurisprudence, as well as his work as a translator of Semitic languages.⁵⁵ In his dispassionate, scholarly notes on Byzantine ceremony, we can discern an attempt at a kind of cultural archaeology, a medieval antiquarianism, similar in method to the ancient form pursued with vigor in early modern Europe. There are important differences, to be sure—Junius, after all, was merely explicating and editing the text, not writing the treatise himself, and he remained a scholar of literary, rather than material, remains. But his impetus to explore cultural practices in a thematic, nonchronological fashion was antiquarian at its core.⁵⁶ Moreover,

54 Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 322–23; cf. Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 158–65.

55 His later work on the Old Testament would emphasize this philological foundation to the proper historical and theological understanding of the scripture, which he also stressed in his orations exhorting students to learn Hebrew. See F. Junius, *Oratio de linguae Hebrae antiquitate et praestantia*, in *Opera Theologica Francisci Iunii . . . Quorum nonnulla nunc primum publicantur* 2 vols. ([Heidelberg], 1608), 1: cols. 1–13; see also Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere* (n. 23 above), 57–65; Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d. Ä.* (n. 23 above), 187–92; Austin, *From Judaism to Calvinism* (n. 25 above), 166–67, where he identifies the same scholarly impulses in Junius's translation of the Old Testament.

56 This textually oriented antiquarian strand, which according to Miller ends in the late sixteenth century with Johannes Rosinus, predated the skeptical Pyrrhonian antiquarianism of Peiresc and his peers, which strongly preferred material remains to textual sources and which marked an epistemological crisis in historical scholarship. On antiquarianism in early modern Europe, see A. Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *JWarb* 13, nos. 3–4 (1950): 285–315; idem, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), 54–79; P. N. Miller, "Major Trends in European Antiquarianism, Petrarch to Peiresc," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, ed. D. Woolf, vol. 3, 1400–1800, ed. J. Rabasa et al. (Oxford, 2012), 244–60.

greco-romani ed italo-bizantini (Rome, 1987); Flavio Biondo's oration to Frederick III and Alfonso of Aragon, where he calls Alexios I "imperator Constantinopolitano semiinfideli," in *Scritti inediti e rari di Biondi Flavio*, ed. B. Nogara (Rome, 1927), 112.28; on the decline in Protestant views of eastern Christianity from Luther's famous declaration that the Greeks were "catholicissimi non schismatici," see Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica* (n. 8 above), 35–39.

his refusal to denigrate the Orthodox rites described by Pseudo-Kodinos shows his inclination toward religious accommodation, along with a yearning for cross-confessional dialogue.⁵⁷ In short, Junius's view of Byzantium was a product of his intellectual commitments, his personal experience, and the cultural conditions of late sixteenth-century Europe.

Second, Junius's Pseudo-Kodinos demonstrates just how vibrant and useful Byzantium could be in early modern Europe. This Byzantium is worlds apart from that of Wolf or Gibbon, from the purveyors of disdain and decline. Representing an altogether different strand of Byzantine scholarship, Junius's reading of court ceremony illustrates one way in which a dead empire could still pulse with vital energy. In a discordant and divided Europe, riven by more than fifty years of bloody religious warfare, Junius imagined Pseudo-Kodinos as a link between parts of a fractured whole—between divided histories, eras, and empires—as an expression of the didactic value of an ecumenical approach to the past. This Byzantium, unmarked by the stigma of religious schism or political corruption, was a far cry from the vilifications of the state and its ceremony that would follow.

Polemics in the Palace: Jakob Gretser and Byzantium

A generation later, deep in the heart of Catholic Bavaria, a different editor saw new and altogether less irenic opportunities in both Pseudo-Kodinos and Junius. Gretser, Jesuit philologist, controversialist, and author of morally edifying dramas, earned the nickname the “hammer of heretics” for his aggressive polemics. Gretser was also among the Jesuit leaders of the new movement of “positive theology” that emerged in Counter-Reformation Germany and France.⁵⁸ Using

the critical techniques honed by Christian humanists in the early sixteenth century, these scholars dedicated themselves to a renewed engagement with patristics, scripture, and ecclesiastical history, a scholarly project coordinated by the goal of demonstrating the Catholic faith's fidelity to the precepts and practices of the ancient church.⁵⁹ A teacher at the Jesuit college in Ingolstadt, Gretser, along with fellow Jesuits like Matthäus Rader and Jakob Spanmüller (or Pontanus), devoted himself to reading, editing, and analyzing the texts of the Greek Orthodox Church. Collectively this group of scholars edited the works of canonical authors of the Orthodox tradition, such as Cyril of Alexandria, John Klimakos, Symeon the New Theologian, and Manuel Kalekas.⁶⁰

Gretser completed his edition of Pseudo-Kodinos in 1620, almost two decades after Junius's death, and in a brief letter to the reader, Gretser declares that he turned to the ceremonial text only after the persistent requests of other scholars.⁶¹ Like any good humanist, he is more ready to disparage his predecessor than

on Gretser's dramatic works, E. Devlin, *Jakob Gretser and the German Jesuit Drama in the Sixteenth Century* (Lexington, KY, 1973). For Gretser's *nom de guerre*, see his entry in A. Possevino, *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores veteris & Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1608), 2:783. For a curated roster of other scholars' judgments about Gretser, see *De vita, virtute et doctrina venerabilis P. Jacobi Gretseri S.J.*, in *Jacobi Gretseri Societatis Jesu Theologi Opera Omnia*, vol. 1 (Regensburg, 1734), x–xv; more critical is E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 5 (London, 1788), ch. 49, n. 11. On his career as a polemicist, see Herzog, “Jakob Gretser's Leben und Werk,” 15–22, esp. n. 103, where the author notes that even some of Gretser's allies lamented the ferocity of his attacks.

59 A scholarly project analyzed by Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica*, 67–80, esp. 72–73, where he quotes the mission statement of Claudio Acquaviva, general of the Jesuit order, for the *Academia ecclesiastica*: “Finis Academiae huius institutionis est cognitio Historiae Ecclesiasticae et progressionum quas per omnes aetates Ecclesia fecit ad illustranda et confirmanda catholicorum dogmata et haereticorum confutanda. . . .”

60 For a concise summary of the efforts of this Ingolstadt group, see Beck, “Die byzantinischen Studien in Deutschland” (n. 7 above), 84–87.

61 Though Gretser completed his new edition of the Pseudo-Kodinos in 1620, it was only printed in 1625 with his three-book commentary and his treatise on divine images, *Syntagma de imaginibus manu non factis, deque aliis a Sancto Luca pictis*. I am preparing another article for publication that will discuss the preface to this edition and the relationship between Gretser and the publisher in the context of ritual, constitutions, and state formation in early modern Europe.

57 This irenic theme, latent in his edition of Pseudo-Kodinos, received its fullest treatment in his treatise published just a few years later in 1593: *Eirenicum de pace Ecclesiae catholicae* (Leiden, 1593); Sarx, *Franciscus Junius d.Ä.*, 109–38.

58 For recent bibliography, see “Jakob Gretser,” in *Bibliographie sur l'histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus: 1901–1980*, ed. L. Polgár, vol. 3 (Rome, 1990), 97–98; “Gretser, Jakob,” in *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, ed. C. E. O'Neill and J. M. Domínguez, 4 vols. (Rome, 2001), 2:1814. A brief and thorough biographical and bibliographical sketch is in U. Herzog, “Jakob Gretser's Leben und Werk: Ein Überblick,” *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 11 (1970): 1–36;

praise him—what Junius’s son-in-law Vossius called “the rampant disease of learned men”—and accordingly, he claims his chief mandate is to correct the innumerable errors in the two previous editions prepared by Junius.⁶² Gretser’s censures were accurate to a point—the 1588 edition had indeed been problematic, marred in part by the flawed manuscript Junius had used. With a much better manuscript of the text in hand, Junius updated his edition eight years later. Unfortunately, this 1596 edition was afflicted by many of the same infelicities as the first, and as early as 1605 one of Gretser’s publications enumerated errors in Junius’s translation.⁶³ The Jesuit’s primary complaint in his letter is the scholarly and philological inadequacy of the first two editions, and he mocks Junius for being touted as *omniscius* when his work on Pseudo-Kodinos clearly indicated the opposite.⁶⁴ Other than calling Junius *Catholicae fidei immanissimus hostis*, Gretser’s prefatory letter makes no mention of religious or political motivations as a justification for his own edition. But his history with Junius, whose disputes with Cardinal Bellarmine Gretser had refuted at length nearly twenty years earlier, suggests Gretser had motives beyond simply settling scholarly scores.⁶⁵ From his commentary a three-fold polemic emerges: against Junius’s deplorable scholarship; against the Calvinists’ deviant theology; and, finally, against the Byzantines’ dangerous ecclesiology.

The most overt of these attacks targets Junius as a philologist and a historian. Throughout his commentary, Gretser pursues the identification and correction of Junius’s errors with evident relish, and he rarely misses an opportunity to demonstrate his predecessor’s technical shortcomings, primarily in brusquely pejorative judgments of Junius’s reading and translation of the text: *Male Iunius* (188); *Errat Iunius* (192); *Iunius deliravit . . . Iunius plane perverse pervertit* (196); *Iunius . . . inepte* (204).⁶⁶ Gretser is particularly mordant regarding Junius’s proclivity for identifying obscure Semitic roots in Pseudo-Kodinos’s vocabulary. In a note on *κατουνοτόπιον*, Gretser’s observes acidly that Junius derives the word from Arabic, “with his customary success.”⁶⁷

Some of his blows are well struck indeed, but Gretser also had a number of scholarly advantages over his rival. Not only had the Jesuit dedicated his long career to the study of the sort of history of ancient and medieval Christianity, particularly Orthodox tradition, in which Junius was only dabbling, Gretser also had access to vastly superior scholarly resources. To take but one example from postclassical Greek lexicography, a field virtually nonexistent in the 1580s: Gretser derides Junius for translating *ἄρμα* as *chariot* (i.e., *ἄρμα*) rather than *arms*, “as Rigaultius and Meursius show with many examples in their glossaries.” It would be a fair critique, but that Rigaultius and Meursius published their glossaries *after* Junius had completed his edition.⁶⁸

62 G. J. Vossius, *De historicis graecis libri IV; Editio altera, priori emendatior, et multis partibus auctior* (Leiden, 1651), 368: “Sed hic eruditorum morbus est epidemicus: ut non tam cogitent, quantum boni aliquis praestiterit.”

63 Regarding the 1596 reissue: Junius wanted to publish it anew, but the printer preferred to simply reissue the old edition with a new preface and accompanying corrections; the details are related in Vossius, *Benigno Lectori*, in *De historicis latinis*, fol. **v, where Vossius blames it on the printer; see also Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Ältere*, 92, where he suggests Junius’s recent relocation to Leiden was a contributing impediment. Gretser condemned the reissue as a sham (*Lectori*, in *Georgius Codinus*), a verdict to which Vossius, usually a stout defender of his father-in-law Junius, was compelled to assent (*Benigno Lectori*, in *De historicis latinis*, fol. **v). Gretser’s initial critiques of Junius’s Pseudo-Kodinos are in *De cruce Christi, Tomus Tertius* (Ingolstadt, 1605), 53.

64 Gretser, *Lectori*, in *Georgius Codinus*.

65 See J. Gretser, *Apologia pro prima Christi cruce . . . contra Franciscum Junium*, in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 1 (Regensburg, 1734); idem, *Defensio operum Bellarmini*, in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 9 (Regensburg, 1737).

66 The commentary is found in Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 131–306.

67 Ibid., 267: “Iunius hic in Arabem versus *Catunas* ex Arabica advocat, consueta sibi, in his rebus, nisi fallor, felicitate.” See also pp. 203, 204, 205, 281ff. Cf. Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalata*, 332–33, where he proposes *κατουνοτόπιον* is a mix of Arabic or Syriac with Greek; for the passage, see Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos* (n. 11 above), 204.

68 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 213, referencing *Nicolai Rigaltii Glossarium Taxiticum μισοβάρβαρον* (Paris, 1601); J. Meursius, *Glossarium graeco-barbarum* (Leiden, 1610). Gretser ignores the fact that Junius published the reading *ἄρμάτων* reflected in his manuscript, BAV, Pal. gr. 414, 41v. So Junius’s transcription and translation were correct but unfortunately based on a corrupt manuscript. Furthermore, the Jesuit would have been deeply chagrined to learn that *his own* publisher confused the breathings, so that the reading in Gretser’s text is *ἄρμάτων* (p. 38), while his corresponding note (p. 213) explains that *ἄρμάτων*, “sive de armis,” is correct. On the development of Byzantine lexicography in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe* (n. 4 above), 250–87.

Such critiques were philologically and historically sound. But Gretser's determination to enumerate the errors committed by Junius—as well as the Jesuit's well-deserved reputation as a confessional brawler—suggests a religious subtext, a broader polemical agenda that his scholarly critiques are meant to serve.⁶⁹ In light of Junius's bold claims to “unbar the sanctuary” of Pseudo-Kodinos with his linguistic acuity, the very knowledge undergirding much of his biblical exegesis, Gretser's relentless assault on his predecessor's philological acumen constitutes more than just a critique of his Byzantine scholarship. It is also meant to undermine Junius's authority as a biblical scholar. Thus, Gretser's notes are not simply scholarly criticisms. Rather, they express obliquely one of the abiding themes of his edition: the confrontation and rebuttal of Junius the theologian, his version of Pseudo-Kodinos, and his vision of Christianity.

This theological agenda manifests itself in Gretser's extensive notes on the history of liturgical feasts. Here Gretser cannot endure Junius's errors. Pseudo-Kodinos's description of the Feast of Epiphany, which occupies barely a single page of text in Gretser's edition (63–64), receives five pages of commentary on a host of issues relating to the feast, including a running critique of the great Calvinist philologist Isaac Casaubon. Gretser takes Casaubon to task for claiming that the Magi were not kings; for citing John Chrysostom as an authority for celebration of the Nativity on 6 January; and for slandering Caesar Baronius, the foremost Catholic ecclesiastical historian of the late sixteenth century.⁷⁰ Likewise, Gretser devotes an eight-page note to the vigils celebrated in the Orthodox Church

during Holy Week, in which he roasts Junius for his misconstrual of the origin of the *Akathistos* vigil, refuting Junius with a long passage from the “book of the Greek rite,” from which, he claims, Junius should have learned that the hymn originated during a siege of Constantinople, when it was chanted throughout the night by the people and clergy of the city in a standing vigil.⁷¹ Of course, Gretser conveniently ignores the fact that this book, the first edition of the Orthodox *Menaion*, was only published in 1599. The asymmetry between the length of the text and notes in these passages, as well as his strongly confessional critiques of both Casaubon and other Calvinists, confirm that Gretser is hunting bigger game than simply Junius. Rather, he is stalking the corrupt theology of Calvinism in general.

Throughout, Gretser's notes on Orthodox rites, ceremonies, and lexical nuance are interwoven with not just personal but confessional rebukes. The Jesuit criticizes Wolf, Crusius, and especially Junius—all Protestants, of course—for mistranslating the verb *χειροτονεῖν*, which Pseudo-Kodinos uses almost exclusively in his chapter on the promotion of the patriarch. Gretser insists the word must be translated not merely with a political or ceremonial sense but with a religious one as well—for him the promotion constitutes not just an elevation in the ecclesiastical hierarchy but a special form of consecration.⁷² Junius, in particular, Gretser claims, distorted the text “in a Calvinist manner” by translating the word as *eligendus* in one passage,

his sojourn in France, but Gretser viewed him unequivocally as a Calvinist.

71 Ibid., 248–52.

72 *χειροτονεῖται δὲ ὁ πατριάρχης ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλείας (Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, Pseudo-Kodinos, 256.10–11); Δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀρχιερεῖς χειροτονοῦνται σφραγιζόμενοι ἐκ δευτέρου (τὴν μὲν πρώτην σφραγίδα καλοῦσι μικράν, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν μεγάλην, ἥτις ἐστὶ χειροτονία), ὁ δὲ πατριάρχης χειροτονεῖται μόνον (ibid., 256.13–16); Οἱ μέντοι γε ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τὰς ψήφους αὐτῶν χειροτονούμενοι παρὰ τοῦ πατριάρχου (ibid., 258.5–6). Pseudo-Kodinos uses the word in one other place, in his chapter on the promotion of the despot, seemingly in a ceremonial but not explicitly religious sense: Ἀναστάντος οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς περιτίθησιν οἰκιοχειρὼς τῇ αὐτοῦ κεφαλῇ στέφανον διὰ λίθων καὶ μαργάρων, ἔχοντα καμάρας μικρὰς τέσσαρας ἔμπροσθέν τε καὶ ὀπισθεν καὶ ἐκ πλαγίων, εἰ ἄρα ὁ χειροτονηθεὶς βασιλέως υἱός ἐστιν (ibid., 244.18–22). Where Wolf chose to translate the verb *electus*, Gretser insists on *consecratus*; where Crusius used *declaravit*, Gretser demands *consecravit, ordinavit, or initiavit*: Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 275.*

69 Other aspects of his edition evince this new religious focus, however. One significant change Gretser makes regards the division of his text. His edition lists twenty-two chapters in contrast to Junius's twelve. The extra chapters are constituted by breaking the section on the attire for dignities (= ch. 2 in Junius and Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov) into two chapters (3 and 4); and by dividing the section on the dominical feasts (= ch. 4 in Junius and Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov) into nine chapters (6–14), essentially assigning each religious feast its own chapter. This change in organization emphasizes the centrality of religious feasts to this section of the text, though several of these chapters are less than a page long; on the use and importance of heading lists in early modern books, especially reference books, see A. M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven, 2010), 135–37.

70 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 233–37. Casaubon's confessional identity was disputed, as he had been accused of abjuring during

imputing to this translation a denial of the special sacralization of the bishop.⁷³ When Junius erroneously construes a banner displaying the ἀρχιστράτηγος, or the archangel Michael, with an imperial courtier *archi-strategus*, Gretser huffs with exasperation, “That’s why the Calvinist’s note is ignorant.”⁷⁴ Gretser elsewhere reiterates his conviction that as a Calvinist, Junius is manifestly hostile to the Byzantine use of sacred images, accusing him of translating a description of an embroidered ἄγγελος as *nuncium* in order to tacitly desacralize the passage.⁷⁵ As we have seen, however, it is far from clear that Junius shared Calvin’s prejudice in this regard. Such passages indicate that the Jesuit’s quarrel with these men rested as much on their religious commitments as on their scholarly ones, making Gretser’s edition a religious polemic as well as thorough ecclesiastical scholarship.⁷⁶

To these philological and confessional critiques, Gretser adds a political one, as well. For while Gretser devotes great attention to the rites of the Orthodox Church and betrays withering contempt for Junius’s amateur attempts at explication, he also adopts the strongly moralizing and pejorative tone regarding Byzantium, condemnations that prefigure the Enlightenment discourse of decline. In Gretser’s view, the Orthodox Church is worthy of scholarly inquiry, but imperial Byzantium is morally degraded, schismatic, and even dangerous. On the written pledge of faith required of the new Byzantine emperor, Gretser insists that it was absolutely necessary, “since in fact the Greek Emperors were strongly disposed to slaughter and mutilation, as is manifest from all of Byzantine history.”⁷⁷ Adducing *tota historia Byzantina* as the

witness to this failure indicates that the disposition to violence was a cultural rather than a personal flaw. This corruption ran to the heart of the Byzantine political order, according to Gretser, though he stops short of inculcating this flaw in Byzantine imperial decline.

Indeed, Byzantine kingship and political theology are the themes that attract Gretser’s most forceful vituperation, an admixture of scorn and trepidation that runs like a red thread throughout his commentary. The Greeks, he argues, erred in granting supreme spiritual *and* temporal authority to their emperors, a blunder that resulted in a form of perverse adulation. Gretser marvels that canon 69 of the Council in Trullo even permitted the emperor to enter the sanctuary, otherwise forbidden to the laity, a warrant defended by the twelfth-century Byzantine canonist Theodore Balsamon. While Gilbert Dagron has shown that Balsamon was articulating an innovative view of priestly kingship, Gretser indicts the canonist as a “fox,” who was employing this argument as a blandishment aimed at securing promotion to the patriarchate for himself.⁷⁸ Gretser cites this passage from Balsamon to demonstrate the perversion of the Greeks and observes that this ritual license went so far as to authorize emperors to choose the patriarch without the assent of the bishops.⁷⁹ But Gretser here lets his confessional id override his scholarly ego. While the emperor did indeed choose the patriarch, and sometimes deposed him as well, that hardly made him “the Pope of the Greeks,” as Gretser claimed.⁸⁰ To begin with,

73 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 276.

74 Ibid., 225: “Quare vana est illa Calviniani nota”; for Junius’s passage, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 94; cf. Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 129 n. 322.

75 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 196, where Junius’s translation of “ἄγγελον ἓνα” into “nuncium unum” is ascribed to his status as “summus imaginum hostis”; see Junius, *Sapientissimi Curopalatae*, 28; Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, *Pseudo-Kodinos*, 50.7.

76 See T. Conley, “Vituperation in Early Seventeenth Century Historical Studies,” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 22, no. 2 (2004): 169–82, where he identifies similar confessionally tinged invective in a number of other contemporary scholars, like Scaliger, Casaubon, Baronius, and Petau.

77 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 268: “quia enim Græci Imperatores ad cædes et mutilationes valde prompti erant, ut ex tota historia Byzantina liquet.”

78 Ibid., 257–58, where he quotes the accompanying commentary of Theodore Balsamon, which defended the emperor’s unfettered right of entry into the sanctuary. This argument, Gretser maintains, was pragmatic, proffered only to obtain promotion to patriarch: “Sed vulpes, tametsi vafra, ab aliis æque vaftris vulpibus delusa est.” On Balsamon’s view of kingship, see G. Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, trans. J. Birrell (Cambridge, 2003), 260–63; for the canon and passage of Balsamon’s commentary referenced by Gretser, see G. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν δεύων καὶ ἐσπῶν κανόνων*, vol. 2 (Athens, 1852; repr. 1992), 466–67.

79 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 276: “sine Episcoporum suffragiis,” where he claims that even John Kantakouzenos conceded the election was *contra canones*, a reference to the emperor’s speech to the synod in 1353; see J. Pontanus, *Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris de rebus . . . libri quator* (Ingolstadt, 1603), bk 4, ch. 37, cols. 931–32; *Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, vol. 3 (Bonn, 1832), 272.21–74.14.

80 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 112: “Vides hic itidem non Patriarcham, sed Imperatorem fuisse Græcorum *Papam*; qui arbitratu suo Metropolitanos, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos ponebat et

the emperor's role in the church, Byzantine politics, or imperial ideology was, unsurprisingly, constantly contested—and if he had successfully arrogated to the imperial office the authority to appoint and depose prelates, he had usually failed to achieve such compliance on other theological and ecclesiastical issues, most notably the Union of the Churches.⁸¹ In the late Byzantine period especially, the emperor's role was a subject of renewed dispute, as strident churchmen asserted new hierocratic theories to constrain the power of the emperor.⁸² Gretser himself almost certainly knew that his argument misrepresented the scope of the emperor's authority, for elsewhere he cites the fifteenth-century archbishop Symeon of Thessalonike's liturgical commentary *De templo*. Symeon, one of the leading hierocratic voices of the fifteenth century, not only relates how emperors had been barred from the sanctuary, but also argues that it is the bishop, not the emperor, who imitates Christ—and even that the emperor's words cannot effect the consecration of the Host during the Eucharist. Such arguments strongly qualify, if not contradict, Gretser's claim that the Greeks had “transferred all power to their emperors, even ecclesiastical.”⁸³ Of course, Gretser's aim was not the faithful or nuanced representation of imperial sovereignty; rather, he sought to cast Byzantium as a political perversion, where kings had subjugated and even supplanted priests. Moreover, his pejorative evaluation of the imperial state stands in stark contrast to Junius, who judged these imperial rites useful for not only the Holy Roman Empire, but also for reconciling common disputes over law, the church, and history.

deponebat.” This critique appears in a second letter to the reader, which prefaces a list of the Orthodox metropolises that had been customarily transmitted with Pseudo-Kodinos. This list of metropolises, not a part of the text of Pseudo-Kodinos, is from a list attributed to Andronikos II Palaiologos and appeared in the first edition because it was in the manuscript that Junius used; Verpeaux, “Les premières éditions” (n. 15 above), 41.

81 The standard study of this tension between the emperor's royal and sacerdotal nature is Dagron, *Emperor and Priest*.

82 Two especially important figures in the burgeoning discourse on the emperor's subordination to the patriarch were Makarios of Ankara and Symeon of Thessalonike; see D. Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204–1330* (Cambridge, 2007), 351–416.

83 Gretser, *Georgius Codinus*, 276: “Postquam Græci a communione sedis Apostolicæ seiuncti omnem potestatem, etiam Ecclesiasticam, in suos Imperatores transtulerunt.”

Although Gretser is impelled by some of the same late humanist, antiquarian, and scholarly interests as Junius, such as the desire to illuminate arcane rituals obscured by language and time, the Jesuit was manifestly better equipped for the task than his predecessor, as his rich commentary demonstrates. Not only is this apparatus more confrontational, but it is far more sophisticated. Junius, as we have seen, contextualized his work chiefly within the limited Byzantine historical tradition—recently presented by Wolf and Xylander—which connected Zonaras, Kedrenos, Choniates, Gregoras, and Chalkokondyles in an unbroken historical narrative from Creation to the Fall of Constantinople. Gretser, on the other hand, envelops Pseudo-Kodinos in a far richer matrix of authority, adding patristic, medieval, and Orthodox sources to the Byzantine historians cited by Junius. In Gretser's densely argued folio pages, crusade historians share the dock with conciliar *acta*; Latin historians of late antiquity jostle alongside the canonical authors of Greek and Latin patristics, a Byzantine monastic *typikon*, and a Carolingian propagandist. Not only does Gretser possess an intimate familiarity with a range of Greek and Latin sources from the Christian era, derived from a long career of religious scholarship, he is also sensitive to the rich field of contemporary scholarship on Christianity and the Greek Church.⁸⁴ With a superfluity that characterized all his scholarship, Gretser heaps up his citations, mobilizing all these works as sources of (varying) authority to forge a comprehensive and authoritative historical tradition, encompassing witnesses from the ancient, medieval, and early modern world. Yet I wonder if the difference between these two scholars' contextualizations of Byzantium emerges from divergent ideological aims, as well as from dissimilarity in scholarly competencies and available *instrumenta*. Paul Veyne has argued that controversy galvanized the impulse to demonstrative argumentation, that “scholarly annotation has a litigious and polemical origin.”⁸⁵ Perhaps, then, the contrast between the irenic and conciliatory contours of Junius's historical vision and the

84 Among these scholars, the Protestants—Isaac Casaubon; Johannes Meursius, a pioneering postclassical Greek lexicographer and editor of a number of Byzantine texts; and Martin Crusius—attract Gretser's special attention and ire.

85 P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*, trans. P. Wissing (Chicago, 1988), 10.

belligerence of Gretser's accounts for some of this difference in their apparatus.

For Gretser, Byzantine ceremony presented a unique opportunity to vilify and delegitimize a confessional rival. Even more, it permitted him to distinguish the Greek church from the Greek empire. The former was safe historical ground, the latter enemy territory. Gretser's condemnations of the violence inherent in Byzantine society anticipate Montesquieu's famous rebuke of Byzantine society as a "tissue of revolts, seditions, and perfidies."⁸⁶ But his scholarly defense of Orthodox Christianity, absent the denunciations leveled at Calvinism, marks a profound difference from those later historians who saw Christianity as a central factor in imperial decline. Unlike Gibbon, Gretser was willing to parse the religious from the political.⁸⁷

Conclusion

Scholars like Junius and Gretser performed a kind of alchemy of interpretation, transmuting the base elements of hierarchy, ceremony, and costume into more immediately useful alloys: the sinews for historical reconciliation, or grist for personal and confessional feuds. These readings show that the study of Pseudo-Kodinos not only permitted, but even promoted, the most contemporary concerns of these authors. The irenicism of Junius and the polemics of Gretser were not incidental to their interpretations of Pseudo-Kodinos, they were fundamental. Junius saw Byzantine ceremony as one solution to perpetual discord among learned men, a solution that abetted the formulation of a universal human history. Gretser, on the other hand, used Byzantine rituals as a fertile field in which to pursue his confessional polemics and to cleave the ecclesiastically sound *sacerdotium* from the ecclesiologically corrupt *imperium*.

The conflicting judgments of Junius and Gretser regarding Byzantium reflect the place each of them accords to Byzantium in the political hierarchy of

the past. Despite writing after editors like Wolf and Johannes Leunclavius, who seem to use *Byzantinus* as a kind of ethnonym or cultural category, neither Junius nor Gretser follows suit.⁸⁸ Each calls them Greeks. But Junius's dedicatory epistle to Frankfurt and manipulation of Roman legal evidence suggests that he sees the *Graeci* as having enjoyed a share of Roman imperial legitimacy, for they had controlled the *imperium orientale*. Gretser's use of *Graeci*, in contrast, echoes the medieval discourse of Byzantines as morally degenerate and politically illegitimate.⁸⁹ There are undoubtedly patterns latent in the categories used by these and other early modern scholars—whether they considered Byzantine materials and history Greek or Roman, ancient or modern—but more work is required before we can plausibly speculate as to what they might be.

Thus, their readings suggest to us a far richer set of portrayals of Byzantine history and culture than that which took root in the historical imagination from the eighteenth century onward, the image of a New Rome in old clothes, shambling, licentious, and despotic. Gibbon saw the imperial court described by Pseudo-Kodinos as "a monument of pride and servitude," a ceremonial manifestation of Byzantine decline.⁹⁰ And while historians since then have brought a more sophisticated historical consciousness and a much deeper knowledge of Byzantine history to bear on their readings, they have largely recapitulated the views of Gibbon.⁹¹ But the discussion above shows that the eighteenth century's hegemony of decline was preceded by centuries of discord, as readers saw in Pseudo-Kodinos and other Byzantine texts the potential to quicken their

88 See prefaces of Wolf in *Nicephori Gregorae* (n. 19 above), a2; and of Leunclavius in *Imp. Caes. Manuelis Palaeologi Aug. Praecepta Educationis regiae, ad Ioannem filium* (Basel, 1578), 8.

89 See, for instance, Hunger, *Graeculus perfidus* (n. 53 above), 34–36.

90 Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 5 (n. 58 above), ch. 53, n. 48, in which he incorrectly dates the author to the fifteenth century, a misapprehension that persisted into the twentieth century because of Pseudo-Kodinos's spurious association with a chronicle detailing the sack of Constantinople (published in P. Schreiner, ed., *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol. 1 [Vienna, 1975], 121–55), which was often transmitted in the same manuscripts with the ceremonial treatise.

91 See, for instance, Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (n. 9 above), 166; G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. J. Hussey (Oxford, 1956), 532.

86 C.-L. Montesquieu, *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (Amsterdam, 1734), ch. XXI, p. 238: "L'Histoire de l'Empire Grec, c'est ainsi que nous nommerons dorénavant l'Empire Romain, n'est plus qu'un tissu de revoltes, de séditions et de perfidies."

87 S. Runciman, "Gibbon and Byzantium," in *Edward Gibbon and the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. Clive, S. Graubard, and G. W. Bowersock (Cambridge, MA, 1977), 57.

own purposes, ends that differed according to religious, political, and scholarly context.

Therefore, in order to truly appreciate the way any Byzantine text, image, or artifact was read in early modern Europe, we need first to examine closely the contexts of these interpretations, and second to appreciate the inherent complexities and multiplicities. In this way, we can begin to construct a historically nuanced view of how the texts, concepts, and interpretations that shape our discipline today actually developed. To apprehend the formations of Byzantine scholarship in the centuries before Gibbon, we must explore the ways that Byzantium and early modern scholars served each other. Not only do we need more studies on Byzantine scholarship in early modern Europe, we must change the way we approach the topic. A history of Byzantine scholarship cannot be written in a single article—probably not even in a single monograph—rather, it must emerge from the accretion of detailed studies.

Junius and Gretser were only foot soldiers in the ragged ranks of early modern scholars who, either occasionally or frequently, trained their gaze upon the Byzantine past. As such, their readings cannot, of course, be taken to represent all the ways that early

modern scholars read Byzantine history or culture. Even so, they contribute perhaps a few additional tesserae to a mosaic yet to be fully assembled, a new image of *Byzance après Byzance* that follows the course charted by Pertusi in 1967, yet to be fully explored.⁹² For them the study of the textual and material remains of the Byzantine world was not only a historical and philological task, but—insistently and indivisibly—a contemporary and political one. By tipping open these heavy tomes, and squinting at their close-set lines, we can learn more about what the Byzantine past meant to them—and something of how they shaped the Byzantium we study today.

Harvard University
Department of History
35 Quincy Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
aschenbrenner@fas.harvard.edu

92 Pertusi, *Storiografia umanistica* (n. 8 above), 5. “Dovere dello storico è appunto quello di spiegare, di vedere come e perché si giunse a questo interesse specifico, quale o quali idee abbiano dato vita ad una storiografia bizantina, quale sia insomma l’anima di questi studi ai loro inizi.”

✂ I WOULD LIKE TO THANK IN PARTICULAR Dimiter Angelov, who initially encouraged this research and has read several drafts of this article. I have also benefited from the helpful comments of Ann M. Blair, James Hankins, Michelle Melton, Shane

Bobrycki, Susan Stitham, D. Rebecca Snow, and the reviewers at *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, whose suggestions helped me clarify the expression and strengthen the argument of the article.